arXiv:1205.2430v1 [math.AP] 11 May 2012

PARTIAL REGULARITY FOR MINIMIZERS OF QUASICONVEX FUNCTIONALS WITH GENERAL GROWTH

LARS DIENING[1], DANIEL LENGELER[2], BIANCA STROFFOLINI[3], AND ANNA VERDE[4]

Abstract. We prove a partial regularity result for local minimizers of quasiconvex variational integrals with general growth. The main tool is an improved $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation, which should be interesting also for classical growth.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study partial regularity for vector-valued minimizers $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ of variational integrals:

$$\mathcal{F}(u) := \int_{\Omega} f(\nabla u)\,dx, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain and $f : \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function.

Let us recall Morrey's notion of quasiconvexity [26]:

Definition 1.1. *f is called quasiconvex if and only if*

$$\fint_{B_1} f(A + \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi})\,dx \geq f(A) \tag{1.2}$$

holds for every $A \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$ and every smooth $\boldsymbol{\xi} : B_1 \to \mathbb{R}^N$ with compact support in the open unit ball B_1 in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

By Jensen's inequality, quasiconvexity is a generalization of convexity. It was originally introduced as a notion for proving the lower semicontinuity and the existence of minimizers of variational integrals. In fact, assuming a power growth condition, quasiconvexity is proved to be a necessary and sufficient condition for the sequential weak lower semicontinuity on $W^{1,p}(\Omega.\mathbb{R}^N)$, $p > 1$, see [25] and [1]. For general growth condition see [20] and [31]. In the regularity issue, a stronger definition comes into play. In the fundamental paper [19] Evans considered strictly quasi-convex integrands f in the quadratic case and proved that if f is of class C^2 and has bounded second derivatives then any minimizing function $\mathbf{u}$ is of class $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ where Σ has n-dimensional Lebesgue measure zero. In [1], this result was generalized to integrands f of p-growth with $p \geq 2$ while the subquadratic growth was considered in [6].

In order to treat the general growth case, we introduce the notion of *strictly $W^{1,\varphi}$-quasiconvex* function, where φ is a suitable N-function, see Assumption 2.2.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J60, 35J70, 49N60, 26B25.

Key words and phrases. quasi-convex, partial regularity, harmonic approximation, Lipschitz truncation.

Definition 1.2. *The function f is* strictly $W^{1,\varphi}$- quasiconvex *if and only if*

$$\int_B f(\mathbf{Q}+\nabla\mathbf{w})-f(\mathbf{Q})\,dx \geq k\int_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\,dx,$$

for all balls $B\subset\Omega$, all $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ and all $\mathbf{w}\in C_0^1(B)$, where $\varphi_a(t)\sim\varphi''(a+t)\,t^2$ for $a,t\geq 0$. A precise definition of φ_a is given in Section 2.

We will work with the following set of assumptions:

(H1) $f\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\})$,

(H2) for all $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ it holds

$$|f(\mathbf{Q})|\leq K\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|),$$

(H3) the function f is *strictly $W^{1,\varphi}$-quasiconvex*;

(H4) for all $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$

$$\big|(D^2f)(\mathbf{Q})\big|\leq c\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)$$

(H5) the following Hölder continuity of D^2f away from $\mathbf{0}$

$$\big|D^2f(\mathbf{Q})-D^2f(\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{P})\big|\leq c\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{Q}|^{-\beta}|\mathbf{P}|^{\beta}$$

holds for all $\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ such that $|\mathbf{P}|\leq\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{Q}|$.

Due to **(H2)**, $\mathcal{F}$ is well defined on the Sobolev-Orlicz space $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N)$, see section 2. Let us observe that assumption **(H5)** has been used to show everywhere regularity of radial functionals with φ-growth, [12]. Following the argument given in [22] it is possible to prove that **(H3)** implies the following *strong Legendre-Hadamard condition*

$$(D^2f)(\mathbf{Q})(\boldsymbol{\eta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\xi},\boldsymbol{\eta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\xi})\geq c\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)|\boldsymbol{\eta}|^2|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\mathbb{R}^N$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{Q}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$. Furthermore, **(H3)** implies that the functional

$$\mathcal{J}(t):=\int_B f(\mathbf{Q}+t\nabla\mathbf{w})-f(\mathbf{Q})-k\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(t|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\,dx$$

attains its minimal value at $t=0$. Hence $\mathcal{J}''(0)\geq 0$, that is

$$\int_B (D^2f)(\mathbf{Q})(\nabla\mathbf{w},\nabla\mathbf{w})\,dx\geq k\int_B \varphi''_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(0)|\nabla\mathbf{w}|^2\,dx\geq c\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)\int_B|\nabla\mathbf{w}|^2\,dx. \tag{1.3}$$

As usual, the strategy for proving partial regularity consists in showing an excess decay estimate, where the *excess* function is

$$\varPhi_s(B,\mathbf{u}):=\bigg(\fint_B|\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})-\langle\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\rangle_B|^{2s}\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}} \tag{1.4}$$

with $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})=\sqrt{\frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{Q}|}}\mathbf{Q}$ and $s\geq 1$. We write $\varPhi:=\varPhi_1$. Note that $\varPhi_{s_1}(B,\mathbf{u})\leq\varPhi_{s_2}(B,\mathbf{u})$ for $1\leq s_1\leq s_2$ and $|\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\sim\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|)$.

Our regularity theorem states:

Theorem 1.3 (Main theorem)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be a local minimizer of the quasiconvex functional* (1.1)*, with* f *satisfying* **(H1)**–**(H5)** *and fix some* $\beta \in (0,1)$*. Then there exists* $\delta = \delta(\beta) > 0$ *such that the following holds: If*

$$\Phi(2B, \mathbf{u}) \leq \delta \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \, dx \tag{1.5}$$

for some ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $2B \subset \Omega$*, then* $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ *is* β*-Hölder continuous on* B*.*

The proof of this theorem can be found at the end of Section 6. We define the set of regular points $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{u})$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{u}) = \big\{ x_0 \in \Omega : \liminf_{r \to 0} \Phi(B(x_0, r), \mathbf{u}) = 0 \big\}. \tag{1.6}$$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.3 we have:

Corollary 1.4. *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be as in Theorem 1.3 and let* $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{u})$ *with* $\nabla \mathbf{u} \neq 0$*. Then for every* $\beta \in (0,1)$ *the function* $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ *is* β*-Hölder continuous on a neighborhood of* x_0*.*

Note that the Hölder continuity of $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ implies the Hölder continuity of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ with a different exponent depending on φ. Consider for example the situation $\varphi(t) = t^p$ with $1 < p < \infty$. Therefore, β-Hölder continuity of $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ implies for $p \leq 2$ that $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ is β-Hölder continuous and for $p > 2$ that $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ is $\beta \frac{2}{p}$-Hölder continuous.

The proofs of the regularity results for local minimizers in [19],[1], [6], are based on a blow-up technique originally developed by De Giorgi [7] and Almgren [3], [4] in the setting of the geometric measure theory, and by Giusti and Miranda for elliptic systems, [23].

Another more recent approach for proving partial regularity for local minimizers is based on the so called $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation method. This technique has its origin in Simon's proof of the regularity theorem [30] (see also Allard [2]). The technique has been successfully applied in the framework of the geometric measure theory, and to obtain partial-regularity results for general elliptic systems in a series of papers by Duzaar, Grotowski, Kronz, Mingione [15] [16], [17], [18]. More precisely, we consider a bilinear form on $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^N)$ which is (strongly) elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard, i.e. if for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} a^i b_\alpha a^j b_\beta \geq \kappa_{\mathcal{A}} |\mathbf{a}|^2 |\mathbf{b}|^2$$

for some $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} > 0$. The method of $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation consists in obtaining a good approximation of functions $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,2}(B)$, which are *almost* $\mathcal{A}$*-harmonic* (in the sense of Theorem 4.1) by $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic functions $\mathbf{h} \in W^{1,2}(B)$, in both the L^2-topology and in the weak topology of $W^{1,2}$. Let us recall that $\mathbf{h} \in W^{1,2}(B)$ is called $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic on B if

$$\int_B \mathcal{A}(D\mathbf{h}, D\boldsymbol{\eta}) \, dx = 0, \forall \boldsymbol{\eta} \in C_0^\infty(B) \tag{1.7}$$

holds. Here, in order to prove the result, we will follow the second approach.

As in the situations considered in the above-mentioned papers, the required approximate $\mathcal{A}$-harmonicity of a local minimizer $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ is a consequence of the minimizing property and of the *smallness* of the *excess.*

Next, having proven the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation lemma and the corresponding approximate $\mathcal{A}$-harmonicity of the local minimizer $\mathbf{u}$, the other steps are quite standard. We prove a Caccioppoli-type inequality for minimizers $\mathbf{u}$ and thus we compare $\mathbf{u}$ with the

$\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation $\mathbf{h}$ to obtain, via our Caccioppoli-type inequality, the desired excess decay estimate.

Thus, the main difficulty is to establish a suitable version of the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation lemma in this general setting. However, let us point out that our $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation lemma differs also in the linear or p-growth situation from the classical one in [17]. Firstly, we use a direct approach based on the Lipschitz truncation technique which requires no contradiction argument. This allows for a precise control of the constants, which will only depend on the Δ_2-condition for φ and its conjugate.In fact, we will apply the approximation lemma to the family of shifted N-functions that inherit the same Δ_2 constants of φ. Secondly, we are able to preserve the boundary values of our original function, so $\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{h}$ is a valid test function. Thirdly, we show that $\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ are close with respect to the gradients rather than just the functions. The main tools in the proof is a Lipschitz approximation of the Sobolev functions as in [11, 5]. However, since $\mathcal{A}$ is only strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard, we will not be able to apply the Lipschitz truncation technique directly to our almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function $\mathbf{u}$. Instead, we need to use duality and apply the Lipschitz truncation technique to the test functions.

Let us conclude by observing that here we are able to present a unified approach for both cases: superquadratic and subquadratic growth.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

We use c, C as generic constants, which may change from line to line, but does not depend on the crucial quantities. Moreover we write $f \sim g$ iff there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that $c\,f \leq g \leq C\,f$. For $w \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we define

$$\langle w\rangle_B := \fint_B w(x)\,dx := \frac{1}{|B|}\int_B w(x)\,dx, \tag{2.8}$$

where $|B|$ is the n-dimensional Lebesgue measure of B. For $\lambda > 0$ we denote by λB the ball with the same center as B but λ-times the radius. For $U, \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $U \Subset \Omega$ if the closure of U is a compact subset of Ω.

The following definitions and results are standard in the context of N-functions, see for example [24, 28]. A real function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ is said to be an N-function if it satisfies the following conditions: $\varphi(0) = 0$ and there exists the derivative φ' of φ. This derivative is right continuous, non-decreasing and satisfies $\varphi'(0) = 0$, $\varphi'(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$, and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varphi'(t) = \infty$. Especially, φ is convex.

We say that φ satisfies the Δ_2-condition, if there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$ holds $\varphi(2t) \leq c\,\varphi(t)$. We denote the smallest possible constant by $\Delta_2(\varphi)$. Since $\varphi(t) \leq \varphi(2t)$ the Δ_2 condition is equivalent to $\varphi(2t) \sim \varphi(t)$.

By L^φ and $W^{1,\varphi}$ we denote the classical Orlicz and Sobolev-Orlicz spaces, i. e. $f \in L^\varphi$ iff $\int \varphi(|f|)\,dx < \infty$ and $f \in W^{1,\varphi}$ iff $f, \nabla f \in L^\varphi$. By $W^{1,\varphi}_0(\Omega)$ we denote the closure of $C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$.

By $(\varphi')^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ we denote the function

$$(\varphi')^{-1}(t) := \sup\{s \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} : \varphi'(s) \leq t\}.$$

If φ' is strictly increasing then $(\varphi')^{-1}$ is the inverse function of φ'. Then $\varphi^* : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ with

$$\varphi^*(t) := \int_0^t (\varphi')^{-1}(s)\, ds$$

is again an N-function and $(\varphi^*)'(t) = (\varphi')^{-1}(t)$ for $t > 0$. It is the complementary function of φ. Note that $\varphi^*(t) = \sup_{s \geq 0}(st - \varphi(s))$ and $(\varphi^*)^* = \varphi$. For all $\delta > 0$ there exists c_δ (only depending on $\Delta_2(\varphi, \varphi^*)$ such that for all $t, s \geq 0$ holds

$$t\, s \leq \delta\, \varphi(t) + c_\delta\, \varphi^*(s), \tag{2.9}$$

For $\delta = 1$ we have $c_\delta = 1$. This inequality is called *Young's inequality.* For all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t}{2}\varphi'\Big(\frac{t}{2}\Big) &\leq \varphi(t) \leq t\, \varphi'(t), \\ \varphi\bigg(\frac{\varphi^*(t)}{t}\bigg) &\leq \varphi^*(t) \leq \varphi\bigg(\frac{2\, \varphi^*(t)}{t}\bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Therefore, uniformly in $t \geq 0$

$$\varphi(t) \sim \varphi'(t)\, t, \qquad \varphi^*\big(\varphi'(t)\big) \sim \varphi(t), \tag{2.11}$$

where the constants only depend on $\Delta_2(\varphi, \varphi^*)$.

We say that a N-function ψ is of type (p_0, p_1) with $1 \leq p_0 \leq p_1 < \infty$, if

$$\psi(st) \leq C\, \max\{s^{p_0}, s^{p_1}\}\psi(t) \qquad \text{for all } s, t \geq 0. \tag{2.12}$$

We also write $\psi \in \mathfrak{T}(p_0, p_1, C)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let ψ be an N-function with $\psi \in \Delta_2$ together with its conjugate. Then $\psi \in \mathfrak{T}(p_0, p_1, C_1)$ for some $1 < p_0 < p_1 < \infty$ and $C_1 > 0$, where p_0, p_1 and C_1 only depend on $\Delta_2(\psi, \psi^*)$. Moreover, ψ has the representation*

$$\psi(t) = t^{p_0}\big(h(t)\big)^{p_1 - p_0} \qquad \textit{for all } t \geq 0, \tag{2.13}$$

where h is a quasi-concave function, i.e.

$$h(\lambda t) \leq C_2 \max\{1, \lambda\} h(t) \qquad \textit{for all } \lambda, t \geq 0,$$

where C_2 only depends on $\Delta_2(\psi, \psi^*)$.

Proof. Let $K := \Delta_2(\psi)$ and $K_* := \max\{\Delta_2(\psi^*), 3\}$. Then $\psi^*(2t) \leq K_* \psi^*(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ implies $\psi(t) \leq K_* \psi(2t/K_*)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Now, choose p_0, p_1 such that $1 < p_0 < p_1 < \infty$ and $K \leq 2^{p_0}$ and $(K_*/2)^{p_0} \leq K_*$. We claim that

$$\psi(st) \leq C\, \max\{s^{p_0}, s^{p_1}\}\psi(t) \qquad \text{for all } s, t \geq 0, \tag{2.14}$$

where C only depends on K and K_*. Indeed, if $s \geq 1$, then choose $m \geq 0$ such that $2^m \leq s \leq 2^{m+1}$. Using $\psi \in \Delta_2$, we get

$$\psi(st) \leq \psi(2^{m+1}t) \leq K^{m+1}\psi(t) \leq K(2^{p_1})^m \psi(t) \leq K s^{p_1} \psi(t). \tag{2.15}$$

If $s \leq 1$, then we choose $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $(K_*/2)^m s \leq 1 \leq (K_*/2)^{m+1} s$, so that

$$\psi(st) \leq K_*^m \psi\left(\left(\frac{2}{K_*}\right)^m st\right) \leq K_* \left(\frac{K_*}{2}\right)^{p_0(m-1)} \psi(t) \leq K_* s^{p_0} \psi(t).$$

This proves (2.14).

Now, let us define

$$h(u) := \psi\Big(u^{\frac{1}{p_1-p_0}}\Big)u^{-\frac{p_0}{p_1-p_0}},$$

then ψ satisfies (2.13). It remains to show that h is quasi-concave. We estimate with (2.14)

$$h(su) \le K\,\psi\Big(u^{\frac{1}{p_1-p_0}}\Big)\max\Big\{s^{\frac{p_1}{p_1-p_0}}, s^{\frac{p_0}{p_1-p_0}}\Big\}(su)^{\frac{-p_0}{p_1-p_0}} = K\psi(u)\max\{s,1\}$$

for all $s, u \ge 0$. □

Throughout the paper we will assume that φ satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 2.2. *Let φ be an N-function such that φ is C^1 on $[0,\infty)$ and C^2 on $(0,\infty)$. Further assume that*

$$\varphi'(t) \sim t\,\varphi''(t) \tag{2.16}$$

uniformly in $t > 0$. The constants in (2.16) *are called the* characteristics of *φ.*

We remark that under these assumptions $\Delta_2(\varphi,\varphi^*) < \infty$ will be automatically satisfied, where $\Delta_2(\varphi,\varphi^*)$ depends only on the characteristics of φ.

For given φ we define the associated N-function ψ by

$$\psi'(t) := \sqrt{\varphi'(t)\,t}\,. \tag{2.17}$$

It is shown in [8, Lemma 25] that if φ satisfies Assumption 2.2, then also φ^*, ψ, and ψ^* satisfy this assumption.

Define $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{V} : \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ in the following way:

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q}) = \varphi'(|\mathbf{Q}|)\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{|\mathbf{Q}|}, \tag{2.18a}$$

$$\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q}) = \psi'(|\mathbf{Q}|)\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{|\mathbf{Q}|}. \tag{2.18b}$$

Another important set of tools are the shifted N-functions $\{\varphi_a\}_{a\ge 0}$ introduced in [8], see also [10, 29]. We define for $t \ge 0$

$$\varphi_a(t) := \int\limits_0^t \varphi_a'(s)\,ds \qquad \text{with} \qquad \varphi_a'(t) := \varphi'(a+t)\frac{t}{a+t}. \tag{2.19}$$

Note that $\varphi_a(t) \sim \varphi_a'(t)\,t$. Moreover, for $t \ge a$ we have $\varphi_a(t) \sim \varphi(t)$ and for $t \le a$ we have $\varphi_a(t) \sim \varphi''(a)t^2$. This implies that $\varphi_a(s\,t) \le c\,s^2\varphi_a(t)$ for all $s \in [0,1]$, $a \ge 0$ and $t \in [0,a]$. The families $\{\varphi_a\}_{a\ge 0}$ and $\{(\varphi_a)^*\}_{a\ge 0}$ satisfy the Δ_2-condition uniformly in $a \ge 0$.

The connection between $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{V}$ and the shifted functions of φ is best reflected in the following lemma [12, Lemma 2.4], see also [8].

Lemma 2.3. *Let φ satisfy Assumption 2.2 and let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ be defined by* (2.18)*. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q})\big)\cdot\big(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}\big) \sim \big|\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})\big|^2 &\sim \varphi_{|\mathbf{P}|}(|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|),\\ \big|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q})\big| &\sim \varphi_{|\mathbf{P}|}'(|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|),\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q})\cdot\mathbf{Q} \sim |\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2 \sim \varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|),$$

uniformly in $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$*.*

We state a generalization of Lemma 2.1 in [1] to the context of convex functions φ.

Lemma 2.4 (Lemma 20, [8])**.** *Let* φ *be an N-function with* $\Delta_2(\varphi,\varphi^*) < \infty$*. Then uniformly for all* $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ *with* $|\mathbf{P}_0| + |\mathbf{P}_1| > 0$ *holds*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}_\theta|)}{|\mathbf{P}_\theta|}\, d\theta \sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}_0|+|\mathbf{P}_1|)}{|\mathbf{P}_0|+|\mathbf{P}_1|}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_\theta := (1-\theta)\mathbf{P}_0 + \theta\mathbf{P}_1$*. The constants only depend on* $\Delta_2(\varphi,\varphi^*)$*.*

Note that **(H5)** and the previous Lemma imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|(Df)(\mathbf{Q}) - (Df)(\mathbf{P})\big| &= \left|\int_0^1 (D^2f)(\mathbf{P}+t(\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{P}))(\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{P})\, dt\right| \\
&\le c \int_0^1 \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}+t(\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{P}))|)\, dt|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| \\
&\le c\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| \\
&\le c\,\varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

The following version of Sobolev-Poincaré inequality can be found in [8, Lemma 7].

Theorem 2.5 (Sobolev-Poincaré)**.** *Let* φ *be an N-function with* $\Delta_2(\varphi,\varphi^*) < \infty$*. Then there exist* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *and* $K > 0$ *such that the following holds. If* $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *is some ball with radius* R *and* $\mathbf{w} \in W^{1,\varphi}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$*, then*

$$\fint_B \varphi\Big(\frac{|\mathbf{w}-\langle\mathbf{w}\rangle_B|}{R}\Big)\, dx \le K\left(\fint_B \varphi^\alpha(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \tag{2.22}$$

where $\langle\mathbf{w}\rangle_B := \fint_B \mathbf{w}(x)\, dx$*.*

3. Caccioppoli estimate

We need the following simple modification of lemma 3.1, (Chap. 5) from [21].

Lemma 3.1. *Let* ψ *be an N-function with* $\psi \in \Delta_2$*, let* $r > 0$ *and* $h \in L^\psi(B_{2r}(x_0))$*. Further, let* $f : [r/2, r] \to [0,\infty)$ *be a bounded function such that for all* $\frac{r}{2} < s < t < r$

$$f(s) \le \theta f(t) + A \int_{B_t(x_0)} \psi\Big(\frac{|h(y)|}{t-s}\Big)\, dy$$

where $A > 0$ *and* $\theta \in [0,1)$*. Then*

$$f\Big(\frac{r}{2}\Big) \le c(\theta, \Delta_2(\psi))\, A \int_{B_{2r}(x_0)} \psi\Big(\frac{|h(y)|}{2r}\Big)\, dy.$$

Proof. Since $\psi \in \Delta_2$, there exists $C_2 > 0$ and $p_1 < \infty$ (both depending only on $\Delta_2(\psi)$) such that $\psi(\lambda u) \leq C_2 \lambda^{p_1} \psi(u)$ for all $\lambda \geq 1$ and $u \geq 0$ (compare (2.15) of Lemma 2.1). This implies

$$f(t) \leq \theta f(s) + \underbrace{A \int\limits_{B_s(x_0)} \psi\left(\frac{|h(y)|}{2r}\right) dy \, C_2 (2r)^{p_1}}_{=:A} (s-t)^{-p_1}.$$

Now Lemma 3.1 in [21], with $\alpha := p_1$ implies

$$f\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) \leq c(\theta, p_1) A \int\limits_{B_s(x_0)} \psi\left(\frac{|h(y)|}{2r}\right) dy \, C_2 (2r)^{p_1} r^{-p_1},$$

which proves the claim. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega)$ be a local minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$ and B be a ball with radius R such that $2B \subset\subset \Omega$. Then*

$$\int\limits_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|) \, dx \leq c \int\limits_{2B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}|}{R}\right) dx$$

for all $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ and all linear polynomials $\mathbf{q}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\nabla \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{Q}$, where c only depends on n, N, k, K and the characteristics of φ.

Proof. Let $0 < s < t$. Further, let B_s and B_t be balls in Ω with the same center and with radius s and t, respectively. Choose $\eta \in C^\infty_0(B_t)$ with $\chi_{B_s} \leq \eta \leq \chi_{B_t}$ and $|\nabla \eta| \leq c/(t-s)$. Now, define $\boldsymbol{\xi} := \eta(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{z} := (1-\eta)(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q})$. Then $\nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} + \nabla \mathbf{z} = \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}$. Consider

$$I := \int\limits_{B_t} f(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{Q}) \, dx.$$

Then by the quasi-convexity of f, see **(H3)**, follows

$$I \geq c \int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \boldsymbol{\xi}|) \, dx.$$

On the other hand since $\nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} + \nabla \mathbf{z} = \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int\limits_{B_t} f(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{Q}) \, dx \\ &= \int\limits_{B_t} f(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi}) - f(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi} + \nabla \mathbf{z}) \, dx \\ &\quad + \int\limits_{B_t} f(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - f(\nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\xi}) \, dx \\ &\quad + \int\limits_{B_t} f(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla \mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{Q}) \, dx \\ &=: II + III + IV. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{u}$ is a local minimizer, we know that $(III) \leq 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} II + IV &= \int\limits_{B_t}\int\limits_0^1 \big((Df)(\mathbf{Q} + t\nabla\mathbf{z}) - (Df)(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla\boldsymbol{\xi} - t\nabla\mathbf{z})\big)\nabla\mathbf{z}\,dt\,dx \\ &= \int\limits_{B_t}\int\limits_0^1 \big((Df)(\mathbf{Q} + t\nabla\mathbf{z}) - (Df)(\mathbf{Q})\nabla\mathbf{z}\,dt\,dx \\ &\quad - \int\limits_{B_t}\int\limits_0^1 \big((Df)(\mathbf{Q} + \nabla\boldsymbol{\xi} - t\nabla\mathbf{z}) - (Df)(\mathbf{Q})\big)\nabla\mathbf{z}\,dt\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

This proves

$$\begin{aligned} |II| + |IV| &\leq c\int\limits_{B_t}\int\limits_0^1 \varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(t|\nabla\mathbf{z}|)\,dt|\nabla\mathbf{z}|\,dx \\ &\quad + c\int\limits_{B_t}\int\limits_0^1 \varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi} - t\nabla\mathbf{z}|)\,dt|\nabla\mathbf{z}|\,dx \end{aligned}$$

Using $\varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi} - t\nabla\mathbf{z}|) \leq c\,\varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|) + c\,\varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\mathbf{z}|)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |II| + |IV| &\leq c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{z}|)\,dx + c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)|\nabla\mathbf{z}|\,dx \\ &\leq c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{z}|)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}(I), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Young's inequality in the last step. Overall, we have shown the a priori estimate

$$\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx \leq c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{z}|)\,dx. \tag{3.23}$$

Note that $\nabla\mathbf{z} = (1-\eta)(\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}) - \nabla\eta(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q})$, which is zero outside $B_t \setminus B_s$. Hence,

$$\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx \leq c\int\limits_{B_t\setminus B_s} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx + c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\frac{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}|}{t-s}\bigg)\,dx.$$

Since $\eta = 1$ on B_s, we get

$$\int\limits_{B_s} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \leq c\int\limits_{B_t\setminus B_s} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx + c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\frac{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}|}{t-s}\bigg)\,dx.$$

The hole-filling technique proves

$$\int\limits_{B_s} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \leq \lambda\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx + c\int\limits_{B_t} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\frac{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}|}{t-s}\bigg)\,dx$$

for some $\lambda \in (0,1)$, which is independent of $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{q}$. Now Lemma 3.1 proves the claim. □

Corollary 3.3. *There exists* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *such that for all local minimizers* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega)$ *of* $\mathcal{F}$*, all balls* B *with* $2B \subset\subset \Omega$ *and all* $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2 \, dx \le c \bigg(\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^{2\alpha} \, dx \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.2 with $\mathbf{q}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}\rangle_{2B} = 0$. Then use Theorem 2.5 with $\mathbf{w}(x) = \mathbf{u}(x) - \mathbf{Q}x$. ☐

Using Gehring's Lemma we deduce the following assertion.

Corollary 3.4. *There exists* $s_0 > 1$ *such that for all local minimizers* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega)$ *of* $\mathcal{F}$*, all balls* B *with* $2B \subset\subset \Omega$ *and all* $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$

$$\bigg(\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^{2s_0} \, dx \bigg)^{\frac{1}{s_0}} \le c \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2 \, dx.$$

4. The $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation

In this section we present a generalization of the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation lemma in Orlicz spaces. Basically it says that if a function locally "almost" behaves like an $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function, then it is close to an $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function. The proof is based on the Lipschitz truncation technique, which goes back to Acerbi- Fusco [1] but has been refined by many others.

Orginally the closeness of the function to its $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation was stated in terms of the L^2-distance and later for the non-linear problems in terms of the L^p-distance. Based on a refinement of the Lipschitz truncation technique [11], it has been shown in [13] that also the distance in terms of the gradients is small.

Let us consider the following elliptic system

$$-\partial_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij} D_\beta u^j) = -\partial_\alpha H^\alpha_i \qquad \text{in } B,$$

where $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, n$ and $i, j = 1, \dots N$. We use the convention that repeated indices are summed. In short we write $-\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{u}) = -\operatorname{div} \mathbf{G}$. We assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is constant. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard* if for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ holds

$$\mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij} a^i b_\alpha a^j b_\beta \ge \kappa_{\mathcal{A}} |\mathbf{a}|^2 |\mathbf{b}|^2$$

for some $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} > 0$. The biggest possible constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called the ellipticity constant of $\mathcal{A}$. By $|\mathcal{A}|$ we denote the Euclidean norm of $\mathcal{A}$. We say that a Sobolev function $\mathbf{w}$ on a ball B is $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic, if it satisfies $-\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{w}) = 0$ in the sense of distributions.

Given a Sobolev function $\mathbf{u}$ on a ball B we want to find an $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function $\mathbf{h}$ which is close the our function $\mathbf{u}$. The way to find $\mathbf{h}$ is very simple: it will be the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function with the same boundary values as $\mathbf{u}$. In particular, we want to find a Sobolev function $\mathbf{h}$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{h}) &= 0 \qquad \text{on } B \\ \mathbf{h} &= \mathbf{u} \qquad \text{on } \partial B \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

in the sense of distributions.

Let $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{u}$, then (4.24) is equivalent to finding a Sobolev function $\mathbf{w}$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{w}) &= -\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}) && \text{on } B\\ \mathbf{w} &= \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \partial B \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

in the sense of distributions.

Our main approximation result is the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $B \subset\subset \Omega$ be a ball with radius r_B and let $\widetilde{B} \subset \Omega$ denote either B or $2B$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard. Let ψ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\psi, \psi^*) < \infty$ and let $s > 1$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ only depending on n, N, κ_A, $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\Delta_2(\psi, \psi^*)$ and s such that the following holds: let $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\psi}(\widetilde{B})$ be* almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic *on B in the sense that*

$$\left| \fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\, dx \right| \leq \delta \fint_{\widetilde{B}} |\nabla\mathbf{u}|\, dx\, \|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \tag{4.26}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_0^\infty(B)$. Then the unique solution $\mathbf{w} \in W_0^{1,\psi}(B)$ of (4.25) satisfies

$$\fint_B \psi\left(\frac{|\mathbf{w}|}{r_B}\right) dx + \fint_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\, dx \leq \varepsilon \left(\left(\fint_B \left(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\right)^s dx \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} + \fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\, dx \right). \tag{4.27}$$

The proof of this theorem can be found at the end of this section. The distinction between B and $\tilde{B}$ on the right-hand side of (4.27) allows a finer tuning with respect to the exponents. If $B = \tilde{B}$, then only the term involving s is needed.

The following result on the solvability and uniqueness in the setting of classical Sobolev spaces $W_0^{1,q}(B, \mathbb{R}^N)$ can be found in [14, Lemma 2].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $B \subset\subset \Omega$ be a ball, let $\mathcal{A}$ be strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard and let $1 < q < \infty$. Then for every $\mathbf{G} \in L^q(B, \mathbb{R}^{N\times n})$, there exists a unique weak solution $\mathbf{u} = T_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{G} \in W_0^{1,q}(B, \mathbb{R}^N)$ of*

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}) &= -\operatorname{div}\mathbf{G} && \textit{on } B,\\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0} && \textit{on } \partial B. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

The solution operator $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ is linear and satisfies

$$\|\nabla T_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(B)} \leq c\, \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(B)},$$

where c only depends on n, N, $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}}$, $|\mathcal{A}|$ and q.

Remark 4.3. *Note that our constants do not depend on the size of the ball, since the estimates involved are scaling invariant.*

Let $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the solution operator of Lemma 4.2. Then by the uniqueness of Lemma 4.2, the operator $T_{\mathcal{A}} : L^q(B, \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}) \to W_0^{1,q}(B, \mathbb{R}^N)$ does not depend on the choice of $q \in (1, \infty)$. Therefore, $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniquely defined from $\bigcup_{1<q<\infty} L^q(B, \mathbb{R}^{N\times n})$ to $\bigcup_{1<q<\infty} W_0^{1,q}(B, \mathbb{R}^N)$

We need to extend Lemma 4.2 to the setting of Orlicz spaces. We will do so by means of the following real interpolation theorem of Peetre [27, Theorem 5.1] which states, that whenever ψ is of the form (2.13), then L^ψ is an interpolation space between L^{p_0} and L^{p_1}.

Theorem 4.4. *Let ψ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$ and p_0, p_1 as in Lemma 2.1. Moreover let S be a linear, bounded operator from $L^{p_j} \to L^{p_j}$ for $j = 0,1$. Then there exists K_2, which only depends on $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$, and the operator norms of S such that*

$$\|Sf\|_\psi \leq K_2 \|f\|_\psi$$

$$\int \psi(|Sf|/K_2)\, d\mu \leq \int \psi(|f|)\, d\mu$$

for every $f \in L^\psi$.

This interpolation result and Lemma 4.2 immediately imply:

Theorem 4.5. *Let $B \subset \Omega$ be a ball, let $\mathcal{A}$ be strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard and ψ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$. Then the solution operator $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ of Lemma 4.2 is continuous from $L^\psi(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})$ to $W^{1,\psi}_0(B,\mathbb{R}^n)$ and*

$$\|\nabla T_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{G}\|_{L^\psi(B)} \leq c\,\|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^\psi(B)},$$

$$\int\limits_B \psi(|\nabla T_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{G}|)\, dx \leq c \int\limits_B \psi(|\mathbf{G}|)\, dx, \tag{4.29}$$

for all $\mathbf{G} \in L^\psi(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})$, where c only depends on n, N, $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}}$, $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$.

Remark 4.6. *Since ψ satisfies (2.12) for some $1 < p_0 < p_1 < \infty$ it follows easily that $L^\psi(B) \hookrightarrow L^{p_0}(B)$ for every ball $B \subset \Omega$. From this and the uniqueness in Lemma 4.2, the solution of (4.28) is also unique in $W^{1,\psi}_0(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is only strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard, we will not be able to apply the Lipschitz truncation technique directly to our almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function $\mathbf{u}$. Instead, we need to use duality and apply the Lipschitz truncation technique to the test functions. For this reason, we prove the following variational inequality.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $B \subset \Omega$ be a ball and let $\mathcal{A}$ be strongly elliptic in the sense of Legendre-Hadamard. Then it holds for all $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\psi}_0(B)$ that*

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_\psi \sim \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C^\infty_0(B)\\ \|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\psi^*} \leq 1}} \int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\, dx, \tag{4.30a}$$

$$\int\limits_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\, dx \sim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\in C^\infty_0(B)} \bigg[\int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\, dx - \int\limits_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\, dx\bigg]. \tag{4.30b}$$

The implicit constants only depend on n, N, $\kappa_{\mathcal{A}}$, $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$.

Proof. We begin with the proof of (4.30a). The $\gtrsim$ estimate is a simple consequence of Hölder's inequality, so let us concentrate on $\lesssim$. Since $(L^\psi)^* \cong L^{(\psi^*)}$ (with constants bounded by 2) and $C^\infty_0(B)$ is dense in $L^{(\psi^*)}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_\psi \leq 2 \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{H}\in C^\infty_0(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})\\ \|\mathbf{H}\|_{\psi^*}\leq 1}} \int\limits_B \nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{H}\, dx,$$

Define $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ by $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} := \mathcal{A}_{ji}^{\beta\alpha}$, then $-\operatorname{div}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}\nabla\mathbf{u})$ is the formal adjoint operator of $-\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u})$. In particular, using (4.28)

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_B \nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{H} &= \int\limits_B \nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\overline{\mathcal{A}}\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\,dx \\ &= \int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\,dx.\end{aligned}\tag{4.31}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_\psi &\leq 2 \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{H}\in C_0^\infty(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})\\ \|\mathbf{H}\|_{\psi^*}\leq 1}} \int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\,dx \\ &\leq 4 \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{H}\in C_0^\infty(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})\\ \|\mathbf{H}\|_{\psi^*}\leq 1}} \|\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\psi(B)}\|\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\|_{\psi^*}. \\ &\leq c\,\|\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\psi(B)},\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last step Theorem 4.5 for $T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$ and ψ^*. This proves (4.30a).

Let us now prove (4.30b). The estimate $\gtrsim$ just follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx - \int\limits_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx &\leq \int\limits_B \psi(|\mathcal{A}||\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx \\ &\leq c(|\mathcal{A}|)\int\limits_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}| \leq |\mathcal{A}||\nabla\mathbf{u}||\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|$, Young's inequality and $\psi\in\Delta_2$.

We turn to $\lesssim$ of (4.30b). Recall that

$$\psi^{**}(t) = \psi(t) = \sup_{u\geq 0}\big(ut - \psi^*(u)\big),$$

where the supremum is attained at $u = \psi'(t)$. Thus the choice $\mathbf{H} := \psi'(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\frac{\nabla\mathbf{u}}{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}$ (with $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ where $\nabla\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$) implies

$$\int\limits_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx \leq \sup_{\mathbf{H}\in(L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}))}\bigg[\int\limits_B \nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{H}\,dx - \int\limits_B \psi^*(|\mathbf{H}|)\,dx\bigg].$$

Using $T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$ we estimate with (4.31)

$$\int\limits_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx \leq \sup_{\mathbf{H}\in L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})}\bigg[\int\limits_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\,dx - \int\limits_B \psi^*(|\mathbf{H}|)\,dx\bigg].$$

By Theorem 4.5 there exists $c\geq 1$ such that

$$\int\limits_B \psi^*(|\nabla T_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{H}|)\,dx \leq c\int\limits_B \psi^*(|\mathbf{H}|)\,dx.$$

This proves the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_B \psi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\,dx &\le \sup_{\mathbf{H}\in(L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^{N\times n})} \bigg[\int_B \mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{u}\cdot \nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}\,dx - c\int_B \psi^*(|\nabla T_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}\mathbf{H}|)\,dx\bigg]\\ &\le \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\in L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)} \bigg[\int_B \mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx - c\int_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx\bigg].\end{aligned}$$

We replace $\mathbf{u}$ by $c\mathbf{u}$ to get

$$\int_B \psi\Big(c|\nabla \mathbf{u}|\Big)\,dx \le c \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\in L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)} \bigg[\int_B \mathcal{A}\nabla \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx - \int_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx\bigg].$$

Now the claim follows using $\psi\in\Delta_2$ on the left-hand side and the density of $C_0^\infty(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$ in $L^{\psi^*}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$ (using $\psi^*\in\Delta_2$). □

Moreover, we need the following result of [13, Theorem 3.3] about *Lipschitz truncations* in Orlicz spaces.

Theorem 4.8 (Lipschitz truncation)**.** *Let $B\subset\Omega$ be a ball and let ψ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)<\infty$. If $\mathbf{w}\in W_0^{1,\psi}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$, then for every $m_0\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma>0$ there exists $\lambda\in[\gamma,2^{m_0}\gamma]$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda\in W_0^{1,\infty}(B,\mathbb{R}^N)$ (called the Lipschitz truncation) such that*

$$\begin{gathered}\|\nabla \mathbf{w}_\lambda\|_\infty \le c\,\lambda,\\ \fint_B \psi\big(|\nabla\mathbf{w}_\lambda|\chi_{\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda\neq\mathbf{w}\}}\big)\,dx \le c\,\psi(\lambda)\frac{|\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda\neq\mathbf{w}\}|}{|B|} \le \frac{c}{m_0}\fint_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\,dx\\ \fint_B \psi\big(|\nabla\mathbf{w}_\lambda|\big)\,dx \le c\fint_B \psi\big(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|\big)\,dx.\end{gathered}$$

The constant c depends only on $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$, n and N.

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We begin with an application of Lemma 4.7:

$$\fint_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx \le c \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}\in C_0^\infty(B,\mathbb{R}^N)} \bigg[\fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx - \fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx\bigg]. \tag{4.32}$$

In the following let us fix $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in C_0^\infty(B)$. Choose $\gamma\ge 0$ such that

$$\psi^*(\gamma) = \fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx. \tag{4.33}$$

and let $m_0\in\mathbb{N}$. Due to Theorem 4.8 applied to ψ^* we find $\lambda\in[\gamma,2^{m_0}\gamma]$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\in W_0^{1,\infty}(B)$ such that

$$\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\|_\infty \le c\,\lambda, \tag{4.34}$$

$$\psi^*(\lambda)\frac{|\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\neq\boldsymbol{\xi}\}|}{|B|} \le \frac{c}{m_0}\fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx \tag{4.35}$$

$$\fint_B \psi^*\big(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda|\big)\,dx \le c\fint_B \psi^*\big(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|\big)\,dx. \tag{4.36}$$

Let us point out that the use of the Lipschitz truncation is not a problem of the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ as it is C_0^∞. It is the precise estimates above that we need.

We calculate

$$\fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx = \fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\,dx + \fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda)\,dx =: I + II.$$

Using Young's inequality and (4.36) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla(\boldsymbol{\xi}-\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda)\chi_{\{\boldsymbol{\xi}\neq\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\}}\,dx \\ &\le c\fint_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|\chi_{\{\boldsymbol{\xi}\neq\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\}})\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx =: II_1 + II_2, \end{aligned}$$

where c depends on $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\Delta_2(\psi,\psi^*)$. With Hölder's inequality we get

$$II_1 \le c\bigg(\fint_B \big(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u})|)\big)^s\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}}\bigg(\frac{|\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\neq\boldsymbol{\xi}\}|}{|B|}\bigg)^{1-\frac{1}{s}}.$$

If follows from (4.35), (4.33) and $\lambda\ge\gamma$ that

$$\frac{|\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\neq\boldsymbol{\xi}\}|}{|B|} \le \frac{c\psi^*(\gamma)}{m_0\psi^*(\lambda)} \le \frac{c}{m_0}.$$

Thus

$$II_1 \le c\bigg(\fint_B \big(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u})|)\big)^s\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}}\bigg(\frac{c}{m_0}\bigg)^{1-\frac{1}{s}}.$$

We choose m_0 so large such that

$$II_1 \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\bigg(\fint_B \big(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u})|)\big)^s\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}}.$$

Since $\mathbf{u}$ is almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic and $\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\|_\infty \le c\,\lambda \le c\,2^{m_0}\gamma$ we have

$$|I| \le \delta\fint_{\widetilde{B}} |\nabla\mathbf{u}|\,dx\,\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\|_\infty \le \delta\fint_{\widetilde{B}} |\nabla\mathbf{u}|\,dx\,c\,2^{m_0}\gamma.$$

We apply Young's inequality and (4.33) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\le \delta 2^{m_0} c\bigg(\fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx + \psi^*(\gamma)\bigg) \\ &\le \delta 2^{m_0} c\fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx + \delta 2^{m_0} c\fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we choose $\delta>0$ so small such that $\delta 2^{m_0}c \le \varepsilon/2$. Thus

$$|I| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx.$$

Combining the estimates for I, II and II_1 we get

$$\fint_B \mathcal{A}\nabla\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx \le \varepsilon\Bigg(\bigg(\fint_B \big(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\big)^s\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}} + \fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx\Bigg) + \fint_B \psi^*(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|)\,dx.$$

Now taking the supremum over all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in C_0^\infty(B)$ and using (4.32) we get

$$\fint_B \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{w}|)\,dx \le \varepsilon\Bigg(\bigg(\fint_B \big(\psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\big)^s\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{s}} + \fint_{\widetilde{B}} \psi(|\nabla\mathbf{u}|)\,dx\Bigg).$$

The claim follows by Poincaré inequality, see Theorem 2.5. □

5. Almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonicity

The following result is a special case of [9, Lemma A.2].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a ball and $\mathbf{w} \in W^{1,\varphi}(B)$. Then*

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{w}) - \langle\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{w})\rangle_B|^2\,dx \sim \fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{w}\rangle_B)|^2\,dx.$$

The constants are independent of B and $\mathbf{w}$; they only depend on the characteristics of φ.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $\delta > 0$, which only depends on the characteristics of φ, such that for every ball B with $B \subset\subset \Omega$ and every $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}(B)$ the estimate*

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \langle\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\rangle_B|^2\,dx \le \delta \fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \tag{5.37}$$

implies

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \le 4\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2, \tag{5.38}$$

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \langle\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\rangle_B|^2\,dx \le 4\,\delta\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2. \tag{5.39}$$

Proof. It follows from (5.37) and Lemma 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2\,dx &\le 2\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2\,dx + 2\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2\\ &\le c\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \langle\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\rangle_B|^2\,dx + 2\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2\\ &\le \delta\,c\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2\,dx + 2\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2.\end{aligned}$$

For small δ we absorb the first term of the right-hand side to get (5.38). The remaining estimate (5.39) is a combination of (5.37) and (5.38). □

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be a local minimizer of* $\mathcal{F}$*. Then for every ball* B *with* $2B \subset\subset \Omega$ *and every* $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$ *it holds*

$$\fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \le c\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\fint_{2B} |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|\,dx\bigg).$$

Proof. From Corollary 3.3 we get

$$\fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \le c\bigg(\fint_{2B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)^\alpha\,dx\bigg)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

We can apply then Corollary 3.4 in [9] to conclude. □

Lemma 5.4. *For all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists* $\delta > 0$*, which only depends on* ε *and the characteristics of* φ*, such that for every ball* B *with* $B \subset\subset \Omega$ *and every* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}(B)$

$$\fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \langle \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\rangle_B|^2\,dx \le \delta \fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \tag{5.40}$$

implies

$$\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|\,dx \le \varepsilon\,|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|. \tag{5.41}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{Q} = \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B$. Then, by Jensen's inequality and Lemma 5.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|}\bigg(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|\,dx\bigg) &\le \fint_B \varphi_{|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|)\,dx \\
&\le c \fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2\,dx \\
&\le \delta\,c\,|\mathbf{V}(\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B)|^2 \\
&\le \delta\,c\,\varphi(|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|) \\
&\le \delta\,c\,\varphi_{|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|}(|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|).
\end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used the fact that $\varphi(a) \sim \varphi_a(a)$ for $a \ge 0$. Using the Δ_2-condition of $\varphi_{|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|}$ it follows that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|\,dx \le \varepsilon\,|\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B|.$$

□

Note that the smallness assumption in (5.40) automatically implies that $\langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_B \neq 0$ (unless $\nabla \mathbf{u} = 0$ on B). So the smallness assumption ensures that in some sense in the non-degenerate situation.

Lemma 5.5. *For all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that for every local minimizer* $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega)$ *of* $\mathcal{F}$ *and every ball* B *with* $2B \subset\subset \Omega$ *and*

$$\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \langle \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\rangle_{2B}|^2\,dx \le \delta \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \tag{5.42}$$

there holds

$$\left|\fint_B D^2 f(\mathbf{Q})(\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q},\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx\right| \le \varepsilon\,\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty. \tag{5.43}$$

for every $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in C_0^\infty(B)$*, where* $\mathbf{Q}:=\langle\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle_{2B}$*. In particular,* $\mathbf{u}$ *is almost* $\mathcal{A}$*-harmonic (in the sense of Theorem 4.1), with* $\mathcal{A}=D^2f(\mathbf{Q})/\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)$*.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\delta>0$ is so small that the Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4 give

$$\fint_{2B}|\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \le 4\,|\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2, \tag{5.44}$$

$$\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx \le \varepsilon\,|\mathbf{Q}|. \tag{5.45}$$

From the last inequality we deduce

$$\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)\left(\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx\right)^2 \sim \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\left(\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx\right). \tag{5.46}$$

Since the estimate (5.43) is homogeneous with respect to $\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty$, it suffices to show that (5.43) holds for all $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in C_0^\infty(B)$ with $\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty=\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx$. Hence, because of (5.46) it suffices to prove

$$\left|\fint_B D^2 f(\mathbf{Q})(\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q},\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi})\,dx\right| \le \varepsilon\,c\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\left(\fint_{2B}|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\,dx\right) \tag{5.47}$$

for all such $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} B^{\ge} &:= \big\{x\in B\,:\,|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|\ge \tfrac12|\mathbf{Q}|\big\},\\ B^{<} &:= \big\{x\in B\,:\,|\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}|< \tfrac12|\mathbf{Q}|\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Euler-Lagrange equation we get $\int_B \big(Df(\nabla\mathbf{v})-Df(\mathbf{Q})\big):\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\,dx=0$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\fint_B D^2 f(\mathbf{Q})(\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q},\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi})\,dx\\ &\qquad=\fint_B\int_0^1 \big(D^2f(\mathbf{Q})-D^2f(\mathbf{Q}+\theta(\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q}))\big)(\nabla\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{Q},\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi})\,d\theta\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

We split the right-hand side into the integral I over $B^{\geq}$ and the integral II over $B^{<}$. Using **(H4)** we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I| &\leq c \fint_B \chi_{B^{\geq}} \int_0^1 \big(\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|) + \varphi''(|\mathbf{Q} + \theta(\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q})|)\big)\, d\theta\ |\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}||\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|\, dx \\
&\leq c \fint_B \chi_{B^{\geq}} \big(\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|) + \varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}| + |\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\big)|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}||\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|\, dx \\
&\leq c \fint_B \chi_{B^{\geq}} \big(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|\varphi'(|\mathbf{Q}|) + \varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{Q}|\big)\, dx\ \frac{\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty}{|\mathbf{Q}|} \\
&\leq \varepsilon\, c \fint_B \chi_{B^{\geq}} \big(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|\varphi'(|\mathbf{Q}|) + \varphi'_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{Q}|\big)\, dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

We used Lemma 2.4 for the second, Assumption 2.2 for the third and (5.45) for the last estimate. Now, using $|\mathbf{Q}| \leq 2\,|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|$ on $B^{\geq}$ and $\varphi_a(t) \sim \varphi(t)$ for $0 \leq a \leq t$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I| &\leq \varepsilon\, c \fint_B \chi_{B^{\geq}} \big(\varphi(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|) + \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\big)\, dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon\, c \fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\, dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us estimate the modulus of II. Using **(H5)** and $|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}| < \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{Q}|$ on $B^{<}$ we get

$$
|II| \leq c \fint_B \chi_{B^{<}} \varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{Q}|^{-\beta_1}|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|^{1+\beta_1}|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}|\, dx,
$$

where $\beta_1 := \min\{s_0, \beta\}$ with the constant s_0 from Corollary 3.4. Using Young's inequality we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|II| &\leq \gamma\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty^2 + c_\gamma \fint_B \chi_{B^{<}} \varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{Q}|^{-2\beta_1}|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|^{2(1+\beta_1)}\, dx \\
&\leq \gamma\, c\, \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty) + c_\gamma(\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|))^{-\beta_1} \fint_B \chi_{B^{<}} \big(\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|^2\big)^{1+\beta_1}\, dx \\
&\leq \gamma\, c \fint_{2B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\, dx + c_\gamma(\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|))^{-\beta_1} \fint_B \chi_{B^{<}} \big(\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\big)^{1+\beta_1}\, dx \\
&\leq \gamma\, c \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\, dx + c_\gamma(\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|))^{-\beta_1} \fint_B |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^{2(1+\beta_1)}\, dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we used (5.46) for the second and Jensen's inequality, $\varphi''(a)t^2 \sim \varphi_a(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq a$ and $|\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}| < \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{Q}|$ on $B^{<}$ for the third estimate. With the help of Corollary 3.4 we get

$$
|II| \leq \gamma\, c \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\, dx + c_\gamma(\varphi(|\mathbf{Q}|))^{-\beta_1}\bigg(\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\, dx\bigg)^{1+\beta_1}.
$$

Using the assumption (5.42), Lemma 5.1 and (5.44) it follows that

$$|II| \leq \gamma\, c \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\,dx + c_\gamma \delta^{\beta_1} \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^2\,dx.$$

Choosing $\gamma > 0$ and then $\delta > 0$ small enough we get the assertion. □

6. Excess decay estimate

In this section we will focus on the excess decay estimate. Therefore, we compare the almost harmonic solution with its harmonic approximation.

Proposition 6.1. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\varphi, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following is true: if for some ball B with $2B \subset\subset \Omega$ the smallness assumption (5.42) holds true, then for every $\tau \in (0, 1]$*

$$\varPhi(\tau B, \mathbf{u}) \leq c\,\tau^2 (1 + \varepsilon\,\tau^{-n-2})\,\varPhi(2B, \mathbf{u}), \tag{6.48}$$

where c depends only on the characteristics of φ and is independent of ε.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let s_0 be as in Corollary 3.4. Let $\mathbf{q}$ be a linear function such that $\langle \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}\rangle_{2B} = 0$ and $\mathbf{Q} := \nabla \mathbf{q} = \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_{2B}$. Define $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{q}$. Let $\mathbf{h}$ be the harmonic approximation of $\mathbf{z}$ with $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{z}$ on ∂B. It follows from Lemma 5.5 that $\mathbf{z}$ is almost $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic with $\mathcal{A} = D^2 f(\mathbf{Q})/\varphi''(|\mathbf{Q}|)$. Thus by Theorem 4.1 for suitable $\delta = \delta(\varphi, \varepsilon)$ and by Theorem 4.1 the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic approximation $\mathbf{h}$ satisfies

$$\fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|)\,dx \leq \varepsilon \Bigg(\bigg(\fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}^{s_0}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \bigg)^{\frac{1}{s_0}} + \fint_{2B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}|)\,dx \Bigg).$$

Now, it follows by Corollary 3.4 that

$$\fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|)\,dx \leq c\,\varepsilon\,\varPhi(2B, \mathbf{u}). \tag{6.49}$$

Since $\nabla \mathbf{z} = \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{Q}$ and $\langle \nabla \mathbf{z}\rangle_{\tau B} = \langle \nabla \mathbf{u}\rangle_{\tau B} - \mathbf{Q}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varPhi(\tau B, \mathbf{u}) &\leq c \fint_{\tau B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{z}\rangle_{\tau B}|)\,dx \\ &\leq c \fint_{\tau B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{h} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{h}\rangle_{\tau B}|)\,dx + c \fint_{\tau B} \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|)\,dx \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

For the second estimate we used Jensen's inequality. Using (6.49) we obtain

$$II \leq \tau^{-n} c \fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|)\,dx \leq \tau^{-n} c\,\varepsilon\,\varPhi(2B, \mathbf{u}).$$

By the interior regularity of the $\mathcal{A}$-harmonic function $\mathbf{h}$, [21], and $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$ it holds that

$$\sup_{\tau B} |\nabla \mathbf{h} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{h}\rangle_{\tau B}| \leq c\,\tau \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{h} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{h}\rangle_B|\,dx.$$

This proves

$$I \leq c\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\tau \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{h} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{h} \rangle_B|\,dx\bigg).$$

Using the estimate $\psi(st) \leq s\psi(t)$ for any $s \in [0,1]$, $t \geq 0$ and any N-function ψ, we would get a factor τ in the estimate of I. However, to produce a factor τ^2, we have to work differently and use the improved estimate $\varphi_a(s\,t) \leq c\,s^2 \varphi_a(t)$ for all $s \in [0,1]$, $a \geq 0$ and $t \in [0,a]$. We begin with

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{h} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{h} \rangle_B|\,dx &\leq \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{z} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{z} \rangle_B|\,dx + 2\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|\,dx \\ &= \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle_B|\,dx + 2\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$I \leq c\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\tau \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle_B|\,dx\bigg) + c\,\tau\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|\,dx\bigg).$$

Due to (5.45), we can use for the first term the improved estimate $\varphi_a(s\,t) \leq c\,s^2\varphi_a(t)$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}I &\leq c\,\tau^2\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle_B|\,dx\bigg) + c\,\tau\,\varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\bigg(\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|\,dx\bigg) \\ &\leq c\,\tau^2 \fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\big(|\nabla \mathbf{u} - \langle \nabla \mathbf{u} \rangle_B|\big)\,dx + c\,\tau \fint_B \varphi_{|\mathbf{Q}|}\big(|\nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \mathbf{h}|\big)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Thus using (6.49) we get

$$I \leq c\,\tau^2\,\varPhi(B,\mathbf{u}) + c\,\tau\,\varepsilon\,\varPhi(2B,\mathbf{u}) \leq c\,\big(\tau^2 + \varepsilon\,\tau\big)\,\varPhi(2B,\mathbf{u}).$$

Combining the estimates for I and II we get the claim. □

It follows now, by a series of standard arguments, that for any $\beta \in (0,1)$, there exists a suitable small δ that ensures local $C^{0,\beta}$-regularity of $\mathbf{V}(\nabla u)$, which implies Hölder continuity of the gradients as well.

Proposition 6.2 (Decay estimate)**.** *For $0 < \beta < 1$ there exists $\delta = \delta(\varphi,\beta) > 0$ such that the following is true. If for some ball $B \subset \Omega$ the smallness assumption* (5.42) *holds true, then*

$$\varPhi(\rho B,\mathbf{u}) \leq c\,\rho^{2\beta}\varPhi(2B,\mathbf{u}) \tag{6.50}$$

for any $\rho \in (0,1]$, where $c = c(\varphi)$ depends only on the characteristics of φ.

Proof. Due to our assumption, we can apply Proposition 6.1 for any τ. Let $\gamma(\varepsilon,\tau) := c\,\tau^2\,(1 + \varepsilon\,\tau^{-n-2})$ as in (6.48). Let us fix $\tau > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\gamma(\varepsilon,\tau) \leq \min\{(\tau/2)^{2\beta}, \frac{1}{4}\}$. Let $\delta = \delta(\varphi,\varepsilon)$ chosen accordingly to Proposition 6.1 and also so small that $(1+\tau^{-n/2})\delta^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By Proposition 6.1 we have

$$\varPhi(\tau B,\mathbf{u}) \leq \min\{(\tau/2)^{2\beta}, \tfrac{1}{4}\}\,\varPhi(2B,\mathbf{u}). \tag{6.51}$$

We claim that the smallness assumption is inherited from $2B$ to τB, so that we can iterate (6.51). For this we estimate with the help of our smallness assumption

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigg(\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac12} &\leq \big(\Phi(2B,\mathbf{u})\big)^{\frac12} + |\langle \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})\rangle_{2B} - \langle \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})\rangle_{\tau B}| + \Bigg(\fint_{\tau B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})|^2\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac12}\\ &\leq \big(\Phi(2B,\mathbf{u})\big)^{\frac12} + \tau^{-n/2}\big(\Phi(2B,\mathbf{u})\big)^{\frac12} + \Bigg(\fint_{\tau B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})|^2\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac12}\\ &\leq \big(1+\tau^{-n/2}\big)\delta^{1/2}\Bigg(\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac12} + \Bigg(\fint_{\tau B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})|^2\,dx\Bigg)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

Using $(1+\tau^{-n/2})\delta^{1/2} \leq \frac12$, we get

$$\fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \leq 4 \fint_{\tau B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{v})|^2\,dx.$$

Now (6.51) and the previous estimate imply

$$\Phi(\tau B,\mathbf{u}) \leq \frac14 \Phi(2B,\mathbf{u}) \leq \frac14 \delta \fint_{2B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx \leq \delta \fint_{\tau B} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\,dx.$$

In particular, the smallness assumption is also satisfied for τB. So by induction we get

$$\Phi((\tau/2)^k 2B,\mathbf{u}) \leq \min\big\{(\tau/2)^{2\beta k}, 4^{-k}\big\}\,\Phi(2B,\mathbf{u}), \tag{6.52}$$

which is the desired claim. □

Having the decay estimate, it is easy to proove our Main Theorem.

Proof of the Main Theorem 1.3. We can assume that (5.42) is satisfied with a strict inequality. By continuity, (5.42), holds for $B = B(x)$ and all x in some neighborhood of x_0. By Proposition 6.2 and Campanato's characterisation of Hölder continuity we deduce that $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ is β-Hölder continuous in a neighbourhood of x_0. □

REFERENCES

[1] E. Acerbi and N. Fusco. Semicontinuity problems in the calculus of variations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 86(2):125–145, 1984.

[2] William K. Allard. On the first variation of a varifold. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 95:417–491, 1972.

[3] F. J. Almgren, Jr. Existence and regularity almost everywhere of solutions to elliptic variational problems among surfaces of varying topological type and singularity structure. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 87:321–391, 1968.

[4] F. J. Almgren, Jr. Existence and regularity almost everywhere of solutions to elliptic variational problems with constraints. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 4(165):viii+199, 1976.

[5] D. Breit, Diening L., and Fuchs M. Solenoidal lipschitz truncation and applications in fluid mechanics. *accepted*, 2012.

[6] Menita Carozza, Nicola Fusco, and Giuseppe Mingione. Partial regularity of minimizers of quasiconvex integrals with subquadratic growth. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 175:141–164, 1998.

[7] E. De Giorgi. *Frontiere orientate di misura minima*. Seminario di Matematica della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 1960-61. Editrice Tecnico Scientifica, Pisa, 1961.

[8] L. Diening and F. Ettwein. Fractional estimates for non-differentiable elliptic systems with general growth. *Forum Mathematicum*, 20(3):523–556, 2008.

[9] L. Diening, P. Kaplický, and S. Schwarzacher. BMO estimates for the p-Laplacian. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications*, 2011.

[10] L. Diening and Ch. Kreuzer. Linear convergence of an adaptive finite element method for the p-Laplacian equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46:614–638, 2008.

[11] L. Diening, J. Málek, and M. Steinhauer. On Lipschitz truncations of Sobolev functions (with variable exponent) and their selected applications. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 14(2):211–232, 2008.

[12] L. Diening, B. Stroffolini, and A. Verde. Everywhere regularity of functionals with φ-growth. *Manuscripta Math.*, 129(4):449–481, 2009.

[13] L. Diening, B. Stroffolini, and A. Verde. The φ-harmonic approximation and the regularity of φ-harmonic maps. *submitted*, 2010.

[14] G. Dolzmann and S. Müller. Estimates for Green's matrices of elliptic systems by L^p theory. *Manuscripta Math.*, 88(2):261–273, 1995.

[15] F. Duzaar and J. F. Grotowski. Optimal interior partial regularity for nonlinear elliptic systems: the method of A-harmonic approximation. *Manuscripta Math.*, 103(3):267–298, 2000.

[16] F. Duzaar, J. F. Grotowski, and M. Kronz. Regularity of almost minimizers of quasi-convex variational integrals with subquadratic growth. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 184(4):421–448, 2005.

[17] F. Duzaar and G. Mingione. The p-harmonic approximation and the regularity of p-harmonic maps. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(3):235–256, 2004.

[18] F. Duzaar and G. Mingione. Harmonic type approximation lemmas. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 352(1):301–335, 2009.

[19] Lawrence C. Evans. Quasiconvexity and partial regularity in the calculus of variations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 95(3):227–252, 1986.

[20] M. Focardi. Semicontinuity of vectorial functionals in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste*, 29(1-2):141–161 (1998), 1997.

[21] Mariano Giaquinta. *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations and nonlinear elliptic Systems.* Lectures in mathematics. Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press, 1982.

[22] E. Giusti. *Metodi diretti nel calcolo delle variazioni.* Unione Matematica Italiana, Bologna, 1994.

[23] E. Giusti and M. Miranda. Sulla regolarità delle soluzioni deboli di una classe di sistemi ellittici quasi-lineari. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 31:173–184, 1968/1969.

[24] M. A. Krasnosel'skij and Ya. B. Rutitskij. *Convex functions and Orlicz spaces.* Groningen-The Netherlands: P. Noordhoff Ltd. IX, 249 p. , 1961.

[25] Paolo Marcellini. Approximation of quasiconvex functions, and lower semicontinuity of multiple integrals. *Manuscripta Math.*, 51(1-3):1–28, 1985.

[26] Charles B. Morrey, Jr. Quasi-convexity and the lower semicontinuity of multiple integrals. *Pacific J. Math.*, 2:25–53, 1952.

[27] Jaak Peetre. A new approach in interpolation spaces. *Studia Math.*, 34:23–42, 1970.

[28] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren. *Theory of Orlicz spaces*, volume 146 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1991.

[29] M. Růžička and L. Diening. Non–Newtonian fluids and function spaces. In *Nonlinear Analysis, Function Spaces and Applications, Proceedings of NAFSA 2006 Prague*, volume 8, pages 95–144, 2007.

[30] Leon Simon. *Theorems on regularity and singularity of energy minimizing maps.* Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1996. Based on lecture notes by Norbert Hungerbühler.

[31] A. Verde and G. Zecca. Lower semicontinuity of certain quasiconvex functionals in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 71(10):4515–4524, 2009.

[1] LMU Munich, Institute of Mathematics, Theresienstr. 39, 80333 Munich, Germany. email: lars.diening@mathematik.uni-muenchen.de. The work was partially supported by Gnampa.

[2] Universität Regensburg, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universitätsstr. 31, 93053 Regensburg, Germany. email: daniel.lengeler@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de. The work was partially supported by the European Research Council under FP7, Advanced Grant n. 226234 "Analytic Techniques for Geometric and Functional Inequalities" .

[3] Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Napoli, Federico II, Via Cintia, 80126 Naples, Italy. email: bstroffo@unina.it. The work was partially supported by PRIN Project: “Calcolo delle variazioni e Teoria Geometrica della Misura”.

[4] Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Napoli, Federico II, Via Cintia, 80126 Naples, Italy. email: anverde@unina.it